

Appl. No. 10/662,073
Amdt. dated February 12, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for her attention to this application and appreciates the time she has given to Applicants. Applicants' attorney further thanks the Examiner for clarifying the requirements of the previous Office Action. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, a replacement paragraph in the Specification is presented, as previously required by the Examiner in the Office Action dated August 30, 2006. In particular, the replacement paragraph of page 3 line 21 has been properly identified. In addition, more specific support for claim amendments is presented, as previously requested by the Examiner in the Office Action dated August 30, 2006, and the amendments to independent claims 1, 12 and 23 have been revised to address the concerns expressed by the Examiner in the Office Action dated January 10, 2007. Lastly, Applicants respectfully note that the entire section of Amendments to the Specification and the entire section of Amendments to the Claims have been included, as specified by the Examiner in the Office Action dated January 10, 2007.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing submissions and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By way of the Office Actions mailed August 30, 2006, the Examiner required corrections to the specification because there are two amended paragraphs proposed to page 3, line 4 of the Response dated June 16, 2006 which are not the same, and the second paragraph does not show the required markings as such. Both paragraphs are provided above. Applicants have amended the second paragraph to indicate that it begins on page 3 line 21 (rather than page 3 line 4) and note that the amendment to this paragraph indicates a replacement of the word "materials" with the word "material." Applicants have included the entire section of Amendments to the Specification as required by the Examiner in the Office Action dated January 10, 2007. Applicants believe that this

Appl. No. 10/662,073
Amdt. dated February 12, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2007

paragraph is now in proper form and respectfully request consideration by the Examiner to accept the amendments.

By way of the Office Actions mailed January 10, 2007, the Examiner notes Applicants' remarks on pages 8-9 of the Response dated October 30, 2006. However, the Examiner further notes that such specification sections still do not appear to provide support for the full scope, i.e. the entire ranges, of the claim changes, e.g. "about 70%", "from about 30% to about 65%", etc.

To address the Examiner's concerns, Applicants have revised the amendments to independent claims 1, 12 and 23. In particular, Applicants have withdrawn the proposal to add the feature of: "*wherein the superabsorbent material has a degree of neutralization of about 70%*". In addition, Applicants have removed the term "about" from the proposal to add the feature of "*wherein the superabsorbent material has been neutralized from about 30 mole % to about 65 mole % with a monovalent metal hydroxide, and from about 5 mole % to about 40 mole % with a divalent metal hydroxide*". Therefore, the revised amendment feature now reads: "...*wherein the superabsorbent material has been neutralized from 30 mole % to 65 mole % with a monovalent metal hydroxide, and from 5 mole % to 40 mole % with a divalent metal hydroxide...*". Support for this revised amendment feature can be found in the original disclosure on page 11 lines 19-20, page 12 lines 5-6, page 12 lines 28-29, page 13 lines 14-15, page 14 lines 4-5, page 14 lines 29-30, page 15 lines 15-16 and page 16 lines 4-5. Applicants have included the entire Listing of Claims in the Amendment to the Claims section above. Applicants respectfully note that a description of the remaining proposed amendments and support thereof have been provided in the Responses dated June 16, 2006 and October 30, 2006.

Applicants believe that the revised amendment to independent claims 1, 12 and 23 have addressed the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's consideration and acceptance of the revised amendments, as proposed in the Listing of Claims above.

Appl. No. 10/662,073
Amdt. dated February 12, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2007

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed in this response, or if any additional information is required, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (920) 721-4405.

Applicants sincerely believe that this Response addresses the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and acceptance of the amendments and remarks provided in the Response dated June 16, 2006, and as supplemented by the Response dated October 30, 2006 and by the present Response.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any prosecutorial fees (or credit any overpayment) associated with this communication to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 27 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD N. DODGE II ET AL.

By


Bryan R. Rosiejka

Registration No.: 55, 583

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Appl. No. 10/662,073
Amdt. dated February 12, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I, Bryan R. Rosiejka, hereby certify that on February 12, 2007, this document is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300.

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Bryan R. Rosiejka

Signature:

